

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 27 March 2006. Responsive to the objections and rejections made in the Office Action, Claims 1, 3, and 4 have been amended to clarify the language thereof and/or clarify the combination of elements that form the invention of the Subject Patent Application. Claim 2 has been cancelled by this Amendment.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 2 - 4 due to informalities therein, and Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In Claims 2 - 4, the Examiner objected to the use of a tilde in the designation of a range, and kindly suggested several alternatives. With respect to Claim 1, the Examiner stated that the term "high temperature" was indefinite because one skilled in the art would not know at what point the temperature was high enough.

Accordingly, Claims 3 and 4 have been amended to correct the language thereof. Claims 3 and 4 have each been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Although it is believed that the originally filed Specification provides guidance, to one skilled in the art, as to the meaning of

“high temperature,” Claim 1 has been amended to remove the term “high temperature” therefrom. Therefore, it is now believed that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as anticipated by Slayter et al., U.S. Patent No. 3,207,588. However, the Examiner kindly indicated that Claims 2 - 5 would be allowable if the Claim Objections were overcome.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claim 2 therein. Thus, Claim 2 has effectively been placed in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim, Claim 1, and any intervening claim, which there were none. Thus, Claim 1 and the claims dependant thereon should now be allowable.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

/David I. Klein/

David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: 26 June 2006

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No. 04586

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being electronically transmitted to the U.S.
Patent and Trademark Office, Art Unit # 1755, on the date shown below.
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

/David I. Klein/
DAVID I. KLEIN

06/26/2006
Date